JOHNSTONE STRAIT KILLER WHALE COMMITTEE

Public Response Summary

Prepared by
Gordon Toffan Fusion Consultants
and Robin E. Taylor and Associates

BC Parks
Province of British Columbia
BC Parks

Fisheries and Oceans
Pêches et Océans

92-05287/

Canadian Cataloguing in Publication Data
Johnstone Strait Killer Whale Committee (Canada)
Public response summary : June 1991 information sessions

Cover title.
Co-published by: Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans.
ISBN 0-7726-1534-9

1. Killer whale - British Columbia - Johnstone Strait - Public opinion.
2. Public opinion - British Columbia. I. BC Parks. II. Canada. Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans. III. Title.

QL737.C432J633 1992 333,95'9 C92-092143-4

Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction	1
Part 1 Questionnaire Summary	5
Question 1	8
Question 2	9
Question 3	10
Question 4	12
Question 5	13
Question 6	15
Question 7	16
Question 8	17
Part 2 Verbal and Written Submissions	19
Committee Process	21
Forest Management	21
Land Protection	22
Marine Protection	23
Commercial Fishing	24
Land Access	25
Land-based Whale Watching	26
Commercial Whale Watching	28
Education	29
Native Issues	29
Enforcement/Legislation	30
Research/Photography	30

Johnstone Strait Killer Whale Committee
Public Response Summary

Introduction

The Johnstone Strait Killer Whale Committee was appointed by the Federal Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (D.F.O.) and the British Columbia Minister of Parks to examine the impacts of human activity on killer whales in Johnstone Strait.

The present Committee membership includes:

Dr. Louise Goulet	B.C. Parks
Mr. Ed Lochbaum	D.F.O.
Dr. Ian McTaggart-Cowan	Chair of the Canadian Committee on Whales and Whaling
Mr. John Payne	D.F.O.
Mr. Graeme Ellis	D.F.O.
Dr. John Ford	Vancouver Aquarium
Mr. Pieter Bekker	Ministry of Tourism
Mr. Nicholas May	Ministry of Native Affairs
Dr. Dale Seip	Ministry of Forests
Mr. Ron Lampard	B.C. Parks.

The mandate of the Committee is:

- to assess the importance of Johnstone Strait and Robson Bight to killer whales;
- to assess the impact of human activities on killer whales and their environment; and
- to recommend management options that will ensure the continued presence of killer whales in Johnstone Strait and Robson Bight.

To develop these management options, the Committee relied on its members' expertise on whale biology and habitat, resource management in ecological reserves, commercial fisheries, tourism, forestry, and Native affairs.

The Committee's final recommendations to the federal and provincial governments will be based on the following premises.

1. **The primary objective is to ensure the continued presence of killer whales in Johnstone Strait and to maintain traditional patterns of use and occurrence.**
2. **Decisions will give priority to environmental concerns but will also consider economic and social concerns.**
3. **Fairness and equity will be objectives for decisions regarding human resource use, with user groups being involved in the decision-making process.**

As part of the decision making process, public input was sought before any final management recommendations were formulated. The Draft Background Report of the Johnstone Strait Killer Whale Committee outlined issues and some options for managing resource use with regard to killer whales. Proposed options and some preliminary recommendations were included to stimulate discussion.

To involve the public, provide information and receive comments, the Johnstone Strait Killer Whale Committee hosted open houses (3-7 p.m.) and public meetings (7-10 p.m.) at the following locations:

Campbell River	June 11	Discovery Inn
Port McNeill	June 12	Lion's Hall
Victoria	June 19	Newcombe Auditorium
Vancouver	June 20	Robson Conference Centre.

These sessions were advertised prior to the information sessions on June 4, 1991 in the following newspapers:

Vancouver Sun	Campbell River Mirror
Vancouver Province	Campbell River Courier
Victoria Times Colonist	Port Alberni Valley Times
Nanaimo Free Press	Upper Islander
	North Island Gazette

Over the four days of open house and public meetings, a total of 633 individuals attended the sessions.

Location	Attendance
Campbell River	103
Port McNeill	130
Victoria	180
Vancouver	220

The underlying theme of the public program asked the public:

> *"How can we best ensure that killer whales continue to use Johnstone Strait and Robson Bight in the spectacular concentrations and unique manner that they do presently?"*

Members of the public were given the opportunity for brief (5 minute) presentations. In addition, written submissions were accepted until July 19, 1991. A questionnaire accompanied the Background Report to help the participants organize their comments and recommendations on the information contained in the report.

A break down of the public's involvement in terms of questionnaires, meeting presentations, briefs and letters received was as follows:

Response Mechanism	Number Received
Questionnaires	96
Letters and Briefs	150
Presentations	105

As you go through this document, it is important to keep in mind a number of important points.

- **The Committee was looking for opportunities to work with the public to prepare workable long term recommendations. In reviewing the public's comments they have tried to identify the plan's weaknesses and strengths and looked for suggestions which could be incorporated into the proposals.**
- **This summary is based on 96 questionnaires and 150 written submissions that were forwarded to the offices of B.C. Parks in Victoria or The Department of Fisheries and Oceans in Nanaimo, and on 105 verbal presentations heard at the public meetings.**
- **Participants were asked to use the background report as the basis for their comments.**
- **The public involvement process was not designed to ask participants to select preferred options, therefore the compiled results of the questionnaire do not reflect nor should they be construed to reflect a vote either "for" or "against" the report recommendations.**
- **Although public input was very important in preparing the final recommendations, it was one of several factors that the committee had to consider in their deliberations.**

This document is arranged in 2 parts; Part 1 prepared by Gordon Toffan, fusion consultant contains a summary of the public response to the questionnaire. Part 2 prepared by Robin E. Taylor & Associates contains a summary of the written submissions and the verbal presentations from the public meeting sessions.

PART I

QUESTIONNAIRE SUMMARY

Part 1 of this summary report has been prepared to reflect only the sentiments, concerns and recommendations expressed in the questionnaires that were returned. It should be noted that responses to question 7, (which asked for the respondents level of satisfaction with the public participation process), indicated that the majority of those who responded felt the various elements of the process ranked either satisfactory or very satisfactory.

With regards to the questionnaire, all the respondents did not necessarily answer all the questions. Most of the questions were two part questions that asked the participant to:

1. make a quantitative choice based on elements of the background information and
2. make a written comment it they wished to provide further input. The written comments section was seen as an extension of the quantitative choices, therefore no direct correlation between the numeric summary and written summary was attempted.

In presenting the analysis for each question, the following information will be given:

- The question as presented in the questionnaire.

  e.g.

> QUESTION 1:
> What do you think is (are) the major issue(s) facing Killer Whales in the Johnstone Strait-Robson Bight area?

- For those questions that asked the respondent to priorize elements of the Background Report or indicate their level of satisfaction with recommendation in the Report. (closed-ended questions):
  - a numeric breakdown of responses by issue or topic *and* by level of priority or satisfaction.

e.g.

What priority should the following issues be given in the management of the Johnstone Straits-Robson Bight Area?

Issue	Number of Responses by Priority				
	Low 1	2	3	4	High 5
Protection of Killer Whales	0	2	1	9	83
Tourism and Visual Landscape	5	11	27	24	27
Commercial Fishing	14	16	30	23	14
Timber Harvesting	46	11	11	10	15

- **For those questions that asked the respondent to provide a written comment or to elaborate on their concerns. (open-ended questions):**
  - **the number of written comments recorded on each question**
  - **the main themes of the comments made**
  - **a few examples of comments received. (These comments were chosen to show the diversity and/or level of concerns expressed on a particular topic. They do not necessarily represent a proportonal representation of the response spectrum.)**

e.g.

In addition to being asked to give a priority rating on the above topics, participants were asked to identify other issues. Most of the responses were elaborations of the respondents' reasons for their particular priority rating choices. Sixty-one comments were recorded. Almost half of the written comments reiterated the respondents' concern that the whales must be protected. Tourism and commercial fishing was cited as a source of harassment. Fishing was also seen as a possible competitor for the whale's food supply. The importance of fishing to the local economy and the fact that both the whales and fishermen have used the area for a long time without conflict was also noted. The possible effects of logging activities on the whales were given as the reasons for the low priority rating given to timber harvesting. Native land claims and consultation with the natives was the one major addition topic identified as an issue.

Sampling of comments:

" *Protection of killer whale habitat and controlling disturbances that affect their habitat and food supply.*

Native land claims and native consultation need a high priority. Native representation on the committee and all advisory bodies associated with this issue.

QUESTION 1:

What do you think is (are) the major issue(s) facing Killer whales in the Johnstone Strait-Robson Bight area?

Written Comment Review

Ninety-six statements were recorded for this question. Within these, three areas of human activity were perceived to present actual or potential problems. The most often cited issue suggested that the impacts associated with tour boats and whale watching were of major concern. The next largest number of responses suggested that the impact of the logging industry (siltation, destruction of salmon streams, pollution, increased access) was detrimental to the whales continued use of the area. Commercial fishing within the Reserve was the third issue identified as having a potential for negatively affecting the whales.

Sampling of comments:

" *Pleasure boaters, tour boats, kayakers, fishermen and loggers have lived side by side with whales for over 100 years and as you have said their population is still increasing.*

Negative impact to their habitat from logging the Tsitika, unregulated tourism (land and water based) and unregulated fishing practices.

Boat traffic in the RBMBER - commercial and private. Possible damage to the RBMBER due to logging in the Tsitika and Schmidt/Peel Creek areas.

Logging. No regulations for tourist traffic. Too much fishing - even though fish boats don't bother whales, the whales are losing food.

1. Habitat degradation via logging of Tsitika Valley. 2. Food chain breakage by increasing fishing pressure by commercial and sports fishermen. 3. Water pollution by adjacent human activity such as pulp waste.

Boat traffic - boaters harassing the whales and causing them to restrict their use of the area. This includes whale watchers, recreational and commercial boats. Logging - what impact will this have on the marine environment in the area and/or rubbing beaches.

Preventing further disturbance to the whales from people on land within the ecological reserve in order to allow normal behaviour within the reserve. i.e. no land access.

Too many people competing for their habitat. Too many fishermen in the Bight. Too many tourists whale watching. Too many logging areas in whole strait. Destruction of salmon streams. "

QUESTION 2:

What priority should the following issues be given in the management of the Johnstone Straits-Robson Bight Area?

Priority Analysis

Issue	Number of Responses by Priority				
	Low 1	2	3	4	High 5
Protection of Killer Whales	0	2	1	9	83
Tourism and Visual Landscape	5	11	27	24	27
Commercial Fishing	14	16	30	22	14
Timber Harvesting	46	11	11	10	15

Protection of the Killer Whales received the highest priority rating for this question, followed by Tourism and Visual Landscape concerns. Commercial Fishing hovered around a medium priority rating with Timber Harvesting ranking the lowest priority.

Written Comment Review

In addition to being asked to give a priority rating on the above topics, participants were asked to identify other issues. Most of the responses were elaborations of the respondents' reasons for their particular priority rating choices. Sixty-one written comments were recorded. Almost half of the written comments reiterated the respondents' concern that the whales must be protected. Tourism and commercial fishing was cited as a source of harassment. Fishing was also seen as a possible competitor for the whale's food supply. The importance of fishing to the local economy and the fact that both the whales and fishermen have used the area for a long time without conflict was also noted. The possible effects of logging activities on the whales were given as the reasons for the low priority rating given to timber harvesting. Native land claims and consultation with the natives was the one major addition topic identified as an issue.

Sampling of comments:

" *Protection of killer whale habitat and controlling disturbances that affect their habitat and food supply.*

Native land claims and native consultation need a high priority. Native representation on the committee and all advisory bodies associated with this issue.

Commercial fishing is important to the communities of the northern island. Fishing in the strait should continue and should be monitored to see if there are adverse effects on the whales. Fishing in the reserve should be prohibited.

Resource based industries and tourism interests must come second to the protection of the whales where conflicts arise.

Protection of whales is most important. Although it would be best to stop logging, this issue needs to be dealt as a problem with B.C.'s logging practices. This Committee could recommend that forestry practices be changed in the Tsitika Valley.

I cannot make suggestions about fishing and other boating activities, but if human access by land is closed off half of the battle will be won.

Protection of the whales is most important. Fishing and timber harvesting will not have any effect on them but people will. "

QUESTION 3:

Does the background report provide sufficient and appropriate information on killer whales and the associated conflicts?

Numeric Analysis

Responses

YES - 60	NO - 23

Out of the eighty-three respondents who made a yes-or-no response to this question, sixty indicated that they were satisfied with the information presented in the report.

Written Comment Review

In the "comments" portion of this question, only sixty-eight written comments were recorded. Of these roughly a third re-stated their impression that the background report was well prepared. Remarks that identified shortfall in the background material or studies, focused on a need for more research in the areas of: timber harvesting (siltation, pollution etc.); effects of tourism on the whales; commercial fishing; and the need for more research on the whales themselves.

Sampling of comments:

" *As an uninitiated member of the concerned public, the summary outlined the issue adequately. It seems the Committee has done sufficient research to know the issues and make recommendations given their mandate.*

It lacks seriously in the area of timber harvest. It seems to rely on Ministry of Forests and the Tsitika Follow-up Committee to take care of this.

It is obvious even more research is needed on killer whales and impacts - both long term such as logging, fishing, water pollution etc. as well as short term such as disturbance by sounds, odours, sight of humans and effluent.

It is still a guestimation on the effects to whales from tour boats, commercial fishing, over-fishing, logging etc. Data should be long term and not just this area.

The options are presented with no cost/benefit analysis of consequences. There is no ranking of severity of activity on each other nor whether or not they can co-exist.

Research and analysis of impacts of commercial fishing, timber harvest, tourism are not conclusive and are speculative. No cost/benefit analysis of options/ recommendations.

It addresses the issues according to available information, but there is too much that is not known and we can't afford to risk making mistakes. "

QUESTION 4:

Listed below are four broad aspects contained in the preliminary recommendations (pp. 67-69). For each indicate how you feel about their implementation.

Response Analysis

Issues	Responses		
	Not Important 1	Important 2	Very Important 3
Education	0	17	75
Research	4	42	46
Legislation	5	24	62
Resource Management	10	21	58

The numeric breakdown of responses suggests that in order of importance, implementation of the recommendations contained in the Background Report should focus first on education, then legislation, followed by resource management and finally research.

Written Comment Review

In addition, to the above numeric breakdown, fifty-four written comments were recorded for this question. A number of these written comments emphasized that all four elements were equally important. The majority of the written comments however suggested that the two critical factors in long term protection of the whales were: enforced legislation and firm resource management guidelines. Education was seen as a valuable short term goal while research could be carried out after the whales were protected.

Sampling of comments:

" *All above areas need to be implemented in order to protect the whales.*

Although research is important, the whales must first and foremost be protected from human grievance and interference. Educating must be widespread, legislation with some teeth in it enacted and resource management completed and monitored.

All aspect are equally important and are inter-relate. Resource management (i.e. no fishing in the reserve) are useless unless enforced through legislation. Likewise we need ongoing research to provide education.

Immediate appropriate education could fend off or defer resource management and legislation requirements but in the long run, legislation will be necessary to keep the pressure off from those who want to further develop resources.

Important tools in managing the whales interest: Education - increase exposure to good whale watching practices - all boaters should have to read the rules and through good legislation and enforcement be made to follow them. Resource management - ban commercial fishing from Bight but improve fishing access in adjacent areas. Prohibit firearms on vessels. "

QUESTION 5:

In order of priority, how should these recommendations be rated and implemented?

Priority Analysis

Topics	Number of Responses by Priority			
	Highest 1	2	3	Lowest 4
Education	45	17	12	10
Research	15	22	29	15
Legislation	34	24	15	14
Resource Management	30	21	14	21

As in Question 4, respondents tc this question gave education top priority in terms of its rating and implementation followed by legislation, resource management and research.

Written Comment Review

Fifty-eight written comments were recorded for question 5. The written comments reflected the priorized rating listed above with statements stressing the importance of education, the need for legislation that is enforced, resource management with emphasis on timber harvesting and finally more research.

Sampling of comments:

" *All of these recommendations are very important. It's difficult to priorize them.*

1. Give enforcement officers the tools. 2. Educate the masses. 3. Fill the gaps in knowledge. 4. Adjust resource management if required.

No legislation is necessary at this time. Management as is being done is just fine. Guidelines and education are the best way to go in the management of the resource.

It is unreasonable to separate/priorize education and research or legislation and resource management. In each doublet the former requires the latter. All recommendations will play a role in the overall solution.

Education is extremely important, however without enforceable laws/regulations it will be difficult if not impossible to effectively protect the Orcas in the long term.

Education, research and legislation can be done at the same time and with the same level of priority. Resource management can be interpreted as no further logging or other industrial activities on land and off-shore.

People must be educated, adequate legislation put in place to preserve the habitat. Too many species have suffered dislocation or worse, extinction, because humans interfered with their vital habitat requirements. "

QUESTION 6:

The background report contains some suggested options (see pp. 60-66 in the report). Are there other options that you feel would protect and maintain killer whales in Johnstone Straits-Robson Bight?

Written Comment Review

Within the sixty-seven written comments recorded for this question, a number of comments suggested tougher restrictions on water and land access to the area aimed primarily at commercial fishing and the logging industry. It was also proposed that the size of the ecological reserve should be enlarged and that the area be given a stronger park status. The development of land based observation areas was also mentioned as a means of reducing harassment of the whales.

Sampling of comments:

" *Prohibit commercial fishing boats from waiting between openings but still allow them to retain fishing rights.*

Stricter restrictions on fishing and whale watching and research and enforce the restrictions. Establish an area where motors are prohibited. I think establishing a land based whale watching park is excellent.

Stress the mix of exclusive and multiple use zones. Educate people as to the reasons for these and enforce the rules.

Because each specific area of concern (e.g. whale watching, commercial fishing, logging etc.) has its own options, a comprehensive/collective set of options must be assembled for comparison; they must be treated integrally.

Expand RBMBER to at least double in width and length. Land use in both Tsitika and Schmidt drainages to be for the benefit of whales first and always. Provide an ongoing P.R. effort - "Whales Story".

An education interpretive centre just west of the reserve manned by parks officials. Access through Tsitika Valley. Can do a combo forestry tour from the highway to the interpretive centre.

Option - designate Johnstone Strait/Robson Bight a Wildlife Nature Preserve with wilderness hiking access only. This is the only safe option.

In the area of resource management I feel logging should be discontinued especially in the Tsitika drainage and that commercial fishing should be restricted to areas outside the reserve. "

QUESTION 7:

The committee has tried to be open and objective in assuming this issue. Please indicate your level of satisfaction with the following elements of the public participation process.

Level of Satisfaction Analysis

Topic	Level of Satisfaction		
	Very Satisfied 1	Satisfied 2	Dissatisfied 3
Background Report	29	45	12
Displays	23	52	6
Opportunities for Input	27	50	10
Interaction with Committee	21	48	10
Overall Program Design	19	50	10

From the high ratings given for the five topics listed above, it would appear the public was quite satisfied with the information and the opportunities provided by the Committee for public participation.

Written Comment Review

Part two of question 7 asked "What suggestions do you have for improving the process?" Seventy-four written comments were submitted. In addition to several comments applauding the process, four main topics emerged as areas for improvement. Most often suggested was that more information is needed or more of the background reports should be made available (i.e. the Hay report on siltation). Next was the need for wider representation on the committee (i.e. local people, loggers, fishermen, whale watchers - not just government people). The third most common theme called for more opportunities for public input - not only in terms of more public meetings but also in terms of more dialogue. The fourth most common suggestion was for better advertising of the meeting times and locations.

Sampling of comments:

" *The committee should consider asking for advice from experienced persons in topics under discussion.*

Poor advertising of public input opportunities, I heard of this meeting by word of mouth.

There should be more meetings in more communities. Choosing Campbell River and Port Mcneill as the two north island meetings begs weighted input from vested interests. Not appropriate for a "world class" decision.

All possible facts should have been available (i.e. siltation reports) because it may have been possible then to eliminate one factor (logging) as having an impact on whales. It would then make the committee's job easier.

Set up advisory committee of interested parties e.g. loggers, fishermen, charter association operators, research personnel etc.

More than one meeting in each area. Better public knowledge prior to meetings. Raise awareness of meetings before hand.

More time for public exchange with individual committee members would have been appreciated. As it was in Victoria, we really only heard from 2 members during the evening session.

Please have boxes of your background report available at all future hearings of this type. Please announce hearings far enough in advance for average citizens like me to get a report before the meeting. "

QUESTION 8:

Are there any other topics or issues pertaining to this subject that have not been covered?

Written Comment Review

Fifty-seven written comments were submitted for this question. The four topics most often mentioned as not being adequately covered were: the effects of pollution in the area; Native land claims; the need to look at options such as not allowing any resource extraction (forestry, fishing or mining); and the economic and social impacts of not allowing resource harvesting to take place.

Sampling of comments:

" *I support a moratorium on logging, fishing, tour boat operators and other whale watchers in and above the Bight until researchers are absolutely convinced that each of these user groups is not affecting the whales.*

Issues not covered - Native land claims, Pulp mill affluent killing the waters of Johnstone Strait (and all other pollutants affecting habitat).

You have not addressed the effects of road building, clear cutting, siltation, loss of biodiversity, including salmonoid stocks, increased boat traffic in the strait, effects of global warming, water pollution, or ozone depletion. The focus is too narrow.

The people of the north island need good representation as the resources (whales etc.) are in their area and their lives are the ones affected. We want the whales protected but do not want foolish solutions.

What are the social, economic and environmental costs of the options. We have to be accountable for our decisions , therefore we need to know the costs of our decisions.

Re: Native involvement - perhaps native concerns are not applicable here but we must be made aware of that. The background report needs to discuss it more directly.

How will the forest industry survive without these few remaining watershed areas? What is the true future of this industry? What are the future prospects for fisheries? "

PART II

VERBAL AND WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS

Johnstone Strait Killer Whale Committee

PUBLIC INPUT SUMMARY
VERBAL AND WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS

A total of 150 written and 105 verbal submissions were received by the Johnstone Strait Killer Whale Committee, in addition to the 96 questionnaires. These submissions generally reflected a similar range of opinions to those found in the questionnaire. All submissions reflected a deep concern for the well-being of killer whales and potential impacts on their environment. Many submissions contained thoughtful and eloquent statements regarding management options.

As was stated during the public meetings, analysis of the input was conducted using the following principles:

1. **This was not to be a voting process, therefore numerical analysis would not be used to indicate to the Committee support for one option over another.**
2. **Each submission would be considered for its own merit, to introduce to the Committee new issues or options that had not been previously identified.**

The sheer volume of responses compelled the Committee to consider only the issues and options for management outlined in submissions. These were categorized primarily according to resource use, as had been done in the Background Report. Although these were not analyzed numerically, certain trends did appear. The majority of submissions were concerned with forest management, but most of these either supported or disagreed with the options presented in the Background Report. Relatively few new options were given. Land access was the area where the most innovative responses occurred. Many of these responses clearly showed support for land-based whale watching, and suggested a myriad of ways this could be accomplished.

New options were identified and are given below. These are categorized according to:

- Committee Process
- Forest Management
- Land Protection
- Marine Protection
- Commercial Fishing
- Land Access
- Land-based Whale Watching
- Commercial Whale Watching

Enforcement and Legislation
Research / Photography

A more detailed analysis of the submissions is available upon request.

COMMITTEE PROCESS

- We would ask that your committee structure the user configuration for Robson Bight in a similar fashion to the Tsitika Follow-up Committee using research, planning and balance.

- Consider establishing formal representatives of user groups and public participants to communicate with the Committee.

- Communicate the involvement of the Federal Environmental Impact Assessment process in the Johnstone Strait Killer Whale Committee deliberations to the public.

- Conduct facilitated workshops on the resource management issue with representatives from all user groups and involved participants.

- Utilize the support of private and University programs that address these resource management issues.

FOREST MANAGEMENT

- Form an advisory committee with agency, public and user group representation, including Native groups - leaving out this option under the Forest Management section implies that forestry is not to be considered by the Advisory Committee. This is not acceptable to Greenpeace.

- Please, urge the logging companies as strongly as possible to forego TFL #47 and the rest of TFL #39.

- CPAWS would support establishing a much larger buffer zone in the watersheds and on the coast. There is a need to revisit and redesign logging management plans for the entire Johnstone Strait area. This would involve addressing concerns regarding logging methods as well as logging tenure.

- Insist on the appointment of a whale advisor for the TFC and the support for the establishment of a formal consultative process between the TFC and the JSKWC (and subsequent advisory committee, if established).

- Establish a liaison with the Old Growth Strategy team and involve a network of scientists and managers in assessing the biodiversity and ecological framework of the area.

- Evidently the Forest Act is a clearcut act. You, the Committee, have to recommend that legislation be enacted to:
    1) Prohibit the use of grapple yarders;
    2) Prohibit the use of endhaul in road construction; and
    3) Ensure that a resident caretaker is onsite at all these sensitive watersheds, not as an employee of the forest company, but possibly funded by the agencies responsible.

- If there is significant proof or suspicion of logging harming whales, MacMillan Bloedel will close down operations in that area.

LAND PROTECTION

- Possibly a Class A park and extended ecological reserve land and water area with complete agreement - to any designation - of the Musgamagw native people with land claims here.

- We want the Reserve extended to include everything from Schmidt Creek to Telegraph Cove to the height of land, and the entire width of Johnstone Strait. We suggest the boundaries outlined in the Sierra Club of Western Canada submission, or the area your committee defines as the "core area".

- The Johnstone Strait conservancy should include the Tsitika-Robson Bight area and the following:
    1. The "Telegraph Cove Corridor" (for want of a better term). The corridor should extend from the vicinity of Telegraph Cove to the Tsitika-Robson Bight area and beyond it to the mouth of Naka Creek. It should include the entire slope from the crest of the Franklin Range to salt water. The main watershed is Kaikash Creek. Between the Tsitika-Robson Bight area and Naka Creek it should include Schmidt Creek watershed and the smaller ones draining to Johnstone Strait.

2. The islands in Johnstone Strait including Hanson Island, the Plumper Islands, Pearse Islands and perhaps all of Swanson as well as the western portions of Harbledown and West Cracroft Islands.

MARINE PROTECTION

- Lifeforce also recommends that observation/rehabilitation/sanctuary areas be created throughout BC/Canadian waters for whales and other marine mammals such as dolphins, seals, sea lions and otters. These marine parks should focus on the diversity of BC/Canadian marine life and their habitats which need to be protected. Netted areas of the park can be used for rehabilitation centres for needy wildlife. This will help disperse the concentrations of present whale watchers converging on Robson Bight; they will have a choice of sites and educational experiences.

- The current ecological reserve boundaries are ridiculous, the whole core area (Kelsey Bay to Cape Caution) should be protected so that wherever whales are and humans show up, that's the area that needs to be done - and that's where the charter operators can be of assistance to let federal fisheries or whoever know where there are gatherings of whales and boats.

- A water access plan should be commissioned to balance recreational and commercial activity while dealing with the needs of local fishermen.

- The reserve should be extended east-west and right across to West Cracroft Island.

- As a researcher, Jeff Goodyear has put together a working definition of harassment which might be reasonable for the killer whale issue: the human production of any acoustic, physical or otherwise potentially invasive stimuli or actions, in response to which an animal does not necessarily elicit a detectable (to human observers) change in behaviour or physical state of the individual or group. ...the impact of various human activities can not be based on whether or not 'harassment' occurs, but on what level of harassment are we willing for the killer whales to have to tolerate. Then, we can set limits for acoustic frequencies and amplitudes, levels of behaviourial responses of killer whales which are directly visible/detectable to human observers, or levels of other anthropogenic stimuli, by which we must abide.

- Perhaps establishing a Johnstone Strait Trust similar to the Island's Trust could be considered.

- I am already on record as recommending that you conduct a marine access plan for the management area. At this point, based on the presentations I have heard, I would suggest that you consider limiting marine access to through traffic only in the Strait and totally excluding marine traffic of any kind in the marine Ecological Reserve, except for commercial fishermen.

- The Johnstone Strait conservancy should include the Tsitika-Robson Bight area and the following:
    1. The "Telegraph Cove Corridor" (for want of a better term). The corridor should extend from the vicinity of Telegraph cove to the Tsitika-Robson Bight are and beyond it to the mouth of Naka Creek. It should include the entire slope from the crest of the Franklin Range to salt water. The main watershed is Kaikash Creek. Between the Tsitika-Robson Bight area and Naka Creek it should include Schmidt Creek watershed and the smaller ones draining to Johnstone Strait.
    2. The islands in Johnstone Strait including Hanson Island, the Plumper Islands, Pearse Islands and perhaps all of Swanson as well as the western portions of Harbledown and West Cracroft Islands.

- Possibly a Class A park and extended ecological reserve land and water area with complete agreement - to any designation - of the Musgamagw native people with land claims here.

- I would recommend that the Committee initiate a study of the effects of pollution on orcas. ...what is needed... ...is a much larger and long-term view of the eventual cumulative detrimental effects to the ecology of the area from toxic waste continuously pouring into coastal waters from pulp, sawmill and mine wastes, urban chemicals and poisons, oil spills, etc.

- I would also like to instruct the Committee to demand that all orcas presently held in captivity be set free.

COMMERCIAL FISHING

- There should be a system whereby a fishing vessel which repeatedly violates whale protection regulations loses its right to fish in the RBMBER.

- Develop a simple brochure detailing appropriate behaviour around killer whales, that could be mailed out to every licensed commercial fisherman especially regarding the rubbing beaches.

- We need rules for land access for commercial fishing.

- A management plan for commercial openings in Robson Bight should be worked out with the commercial fishing industry.

- [re: use of firearms and skiffs in the reserve] Take steps to make the Skipper responsible, with fines being imposed if such behaviour occurs, just as fines should be imposed on any Skipper of a vessel seen to be harassing killer whales in any region in the area outside the Reserve.

- A ban on outboards in the reserve would be tolerable.

- If further research definitely indicates a fishery-related problem, a consultative group could be formed to move the anchoring boats to a different area.

- Improved guidelines requiring the fishermen abide by the same guidelines as everyone else, would help decrease disturbance to the whales and would help whale watchers accept the fact that fishing boats are in RBMBER while they are not.

- How about sitting down with the Fishermen and talking the thing through? To the fishermen, that first set is important. But, does it really require three or four days of waiting at anchor? I suspect that the fishermen would be quite willing to allocate the tie-up spots on the basis of traditional use and rights, or perhaps even a lottery. Add to this a prohibition on gunfire and another on active whale-watching within the Reserve, and I think you have the guts of a solution...

- [To] control activities in ER, work with commercial fishermen to gradually move towards removing all activity in ER.

LAND ACCESS

- The bridge at Catherine Creek should be taken out and the road below it replanted.

- We need rules for land access for commercial fishing.

- Establish a trail to the reserve but make it long enough (eg. 2 km) to discourage casual users and add to the effect of arriving at Robson Bight.

- To extend the Reserve eastward to limit access to the rubbing beaches will not improve the current situation. It will only result in a larger area to patrol and monitor.

- All the many problems connected with public access to the core area from the land would be greatly compounded by extending the road behind the ecological reserve.

- "Form an Advisory Committee with agency, public and user group representation, including Native groups" We strongly urge the Committee to list this option in the Land Access section in your final report to the Ministers. Without it, you are implying that land access is not a relevant factor in resource management,or not an appropriate area of concern for a broadly based Advisory Committee. We strongly disagree. If land access, and, indeed, human habitation of the northern part of the Island is not under consideration, the likelihood of being able to make more than cosmetic and very short-term improvements in the conditions for the whales is not substantial.

- Rehabilitate the shoreline road west of Naka Creek. The roadbed should be removed and the area should be returned to a natural state.

- Remove the bridge at Catherine Creek, and rehabilitate the road to Cutblock 101.

- Allow no roadbuilding on the east side of the Tsitika to proceed any further than it already has.

- Possibly construct a well marked hiking trail leading from the western boundary of the Reserve into the old growth forest surrounding the lower reaches of the Tsitika River. This trail to head well away from the beach and to have signs informing people to stay away from the beaches. Part of the value of protecting the forests in the Tsitika would be enhanced by an opportunity for the public to walk through them and learn about them. My assumption is that this could be done without threatening the whale habitat by promoting access to the beaches, but perhaps I am wrong.

- Gates in the Schmidt and Tsitika systems should be located farther from the Strait to discourage access.

LAND-BASED WHALE WATCHING

- The land based whale viewing points described, are only three of a number of other similar sites that are also accessible. Computer landscape analysis and screening techniques would be applied to all harvesting areas viewable from any land based site.

    1. Site "A" - located inside Ecological Reserve #111 on the westerly point of land. All of Robson Bight and a wide vista to the north is visible from this point which would be approximately twenty meters above sea level. Any structure could be screened by natural vegetation or blended into the landscape in such a way that it would not be conspicuous from the water. Viewing could be done from inside the facility behind glass ensuring no noise or movement would be discernable from the water. With its access to the water, this site would likely best serve the needs of the scientific community. If changes cannot be made to the reserve status other shoreline points are available outside the reserve boundaries.

2. Site "B" - located on a rocky ridge at approximately two hundred meters in elevation above and behind the Bight. The view from here is wide vista of about one hundred an eighty degrees and provides the largest viewable area but at a much greater distance (relative to Site "A"). Viewing from this location could be done from inside or outside any facility but would require visual aids. The concerns of shoreline movement and disturbance to the ecological reserve are eliminated.

3. Site "C" - located on the slopes above the rubbing beaches at about two hundred and fifty meters in elevation. The view of Johnstone Strait is unobstructed both east and west. This location provides medium distance viewing opportunities (relative to sites A/B) and the best access to the rubbing beaches for researchers.

The proposed sites are all accessible by road which is the key to making the facility available to the maximum number of visitors. Although the access itself can create some management difficulties if not controlled, dealing effectively with this issue would purely be a matter of commitment. Problems associated with road access to sensitive areas, in many parts of the province, for example some parks, are not uncommon and can be managed, particularly in an area like the Tsitika that already has a year round company security patrol.

- Build blinds and towers at the rubbing beaches which can allow people to view the whales without chasing them away.

- Land viewing access could be developed well away from the Bight on high points of land on Vancouver Island as well as from the proposed WW park. Access could be from hiking trails and possibly from road accessible viewing platforms. As roads will continue to be used and there are those who already view killer whales from present roads, there should be an established plan to control the inevitable demand and exploitation of land access viewing.

- There are numerous vantage points along the shoreline of Johnstone Strait — on Vancouver, Hanson, and West Cracroft islands — from which orcas can be viewed. Some of these sites are at or close to water level, immediately adjacent to the shore, and others are at a higher elevation.

  Trails, for hikers or even bicycles, could be constructed which would interconnect the various vantage points on each island. At the viewing sites, spotting telescopes and hydrophone feeds could be made available for sighting and listening.

  Any planning for land development must ensure restricted access to areas adjacent to the Ecological Reserve around Robson Bight.

Specifically, the following developments are envisaged:

- Vancouver Island: A trail from Bauza Cove to a point midway between Izumi Rock and the western boundary of the Ecological Reserve.
- Hanson Island: A trail from Big Bay to the eastern end of the island at Blackney Passage.
- West Cracroft Island: A trail from Cracroft Point past Growler Cove to the edge of Johnstone Strait adjacent to the Sophia Islands. Some areas adjacent to the trail that have been logged recently could be landscaped for use as picnic areas and campsites. Additionally, an interpretation centre would be constructed in a suitable location. In it, the natural history of the orca would be presented, along with the updated story of the orcas of Johnstone Strait. Live acoustic feeds from the remote hydrophone network would be relayed to this facility. As it is developed, it could become a centre from much of the ongoing research, as well as a source of detailed and accurate information to the public.
- Access to the Vancouver Island trail would be direct, from Bauza Cove. Access to Hanson Island and West Cracroft Island could be via dedicated ferry from Telegraph Cove, Bauza Cove, Willow Creek or Alert Bay. It will be necessary to install a land docking on each island.
- Additional tie-up for small boats will also be needed. The location of the ferry landing and tie-up facilities must take into account the prevailing westerly winds of summer time.

COMMERCIAL WHALE WATCHING

- Pleasure boats should not be allowed to approach whales at all unless in possession of a permit (which could be purchased locally) in a greater management area, an integrated ecological management area.

- Whale watching companies should form a recognized association to which operators must belong to work in the area, and establish a set of practices that all operators must follow.

- We should limit the number of whale watching charter boats, license them, possibly on an annual bidding basis so there can be no monopolies by someone getting there first.

- In New Zealand, at Kikora, they have a licensing system and regulations, and the permitted guides are allowed to get closer to the whales than the general public - that's a good system for Johnstone Strait for several reasons:
  1) permitted guides have to demonstrate certain knowledge of whale watching in order to get their licence (as well as adhering to all the safety standards, etc.);

2) whale watching charters would maintain a certain buffer (Johnstone Strait - 100 m; New Zealand - 50 m) and charters would set the example and everybody else would have to be more than that (eg. 150 m) and the charter fleet could then act as watchdogs for the system to ensure that the general public adheres to the system as well.

- Kayak tour operators:
  Every tour operator (owner and guides) must be involved in an annual pre-season meeting with all other operators. This meeting should be a time for designing a self-regulating system and criteria for whale watching problems and concerns
  a) group behaviour around whales
  b) ethics - whale watching and camping
  c) management methods - ie. park camps, permits, etc.
  d) time restrictions with whales/ certain whale behaviour - no one on the water near resting or rubbing whales

  This group should not be a power structure to eliminate or alienate companies.

EDUCATION

- The commercial fishery is a perfect captive audience for the information officer program at RBMBER, and if the program requires an introduction from someone in the industry, I would be more than happy to go up there myself and assist.

- I would alter recommendation 6 to state that special education programs are manda tory for commercial and recreational fishermen.

- Establish year-round DFO / BC Parks / Advanced Education program to tour schools, rod and gun clubs, commercial fishermen's meetings, etc. to provide a cohesive approach.

- A far more aggressive information campaign is needed - should be readily available to the boating public, perhaps through the Canadian Coast Guard boating safety program, which distributes information to power squadrons, marinas, commercial fishing operations, sport fishing camps, etc.

NATIVE ISSUES

- Why was there not a consideration to have a native doctor [expert] on the Committee? Why were there no native doctors consulted on matters related to the killer whale?

ENFORCEMENT / LEGISLATION

- People on the water should be encouraged to report others who bring harm to killer whales.

RESEARCH / PHOTOGRAPHY

- The people running boats for film crews should be licensed guides who have to know what they are doing, to be able to recognize when the whales may tolerate close approaches and when to back off. You have to have a permit system for film crews as well.

- BC Parks should try to officially designate Boat Bay for a research centre before next summer since it's possible for groups to arrive there early and pre-empt the site. There should be some kind of signed agreement such as a memorandum of understanding between BC Parks and Fletcher Challenge.

- Research at this point may be more valid by withdrawing from research.